UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/842,753	04/25/2001	Outi Aho	460-010296-US(PAR)	8264	
Clarence A. Gre	7590 01/26/201 een	EXAMINER			
Perman & Gree	n, LLP	NAWAZ, ASAD M			
425 Post Road Fairfield, CT 06	5430	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2455		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/26/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/842,753	AHO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	ASAD M. NAWAZ	2455	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 January 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavieal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	callee
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•	,,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	porrosponding number of finally reig	otod claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co.	mnliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324)
<ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ul>		mphant / thoramont (1	102 02-7.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	<b>-</b>		
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-17</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10.		•	
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Asad M Nawaz/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2455	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues in substance A) Preston does not disclose or suggest entirely forming messages from the information to be transmitted without using information from other layers as claimed and B) Preston, Alden and Olofsson do not teach inserting entirely formed messages into data field of frames of a lower layer of a protocol stack

In response to A), Preston discloses at paragraph 0041 that the messages are entirely formed by the application layer as they are application level messages. However, a protocol label is appended which is not considered part of the message generated by the application layer. Therefore, applicant's assertions that the message is formed in two layers is incorrect.

In response to B) Alden was used to explicitly teach the feature of the entirely formed messages being inserted into data fields of frames of a lower layer of said protocol stack. Although applicant provides a definition of prepend, it in no way relates (nor is there an explanation) with encapsulation. It is clear from fig 1 of Alden that when the header is prepended, the enitre previous message becomes its payload. It appears as though the applicant suggests that only a header is attached to the previous message and there is no payload to the message which is inconsistent with technology and applicant's own disclosure.

Therefore, Preston, Alden, and Oloffson still meet the scope of the limitations as currently claimed.